

REMARKS

Applicant has now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of May 20, 2005.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,081,595 to Moreno, et al. in view of Japanese Publication 05-261962 to Takao.

Claims 6 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moreno in view of Takao, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,206,686 to Fukui, et al.

Claims 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, and 14-16 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 12, and 14-18 remain in this application. Claims 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, and 13 have been canceled.

Amendment of Claims

Examiner objected to Claims 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, and 14-16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and intervening claims. Examiner indicated that no prior art was found that disclosed or suggested providing a plurality of calibrated tone-reproduction curves, each tone-reproduction curve corresponding to a distinct halftone type and media type combination.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 12, and 14 to incorporate the allowable subject matter from the objected to claims 3, 5, 7, 10, 12 and 14. Because claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 12, and 14 recite the limitations required by Examiner, Applicant kindly requests that claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 12 and 14 be allowed.

Because claims 9, 15, and 16 depend from the amended claims, they are also now in condition for allowance without modification. Applicant kindly requests that claims 9, 15, and 16 be allowed.

Applicant has amended claim 17 to include the allowable subject matter, similarly putting it in condition for allowance. Claim 18 depends on claim 17, and hence is also in condition for allowance without modification. Applicant kindly requests that claims 17 and 18 be allowed.

Applicant has canceled claims 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, and 13 to avoid redundancy of claims since the allowable subject matter has been incorporated into the other allowable claims.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted that Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 12, and 14-18 are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this Amendment B. However, the undersigned attorney of record hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Patrick R. Roche, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

Aug. 28, 2005
Date


Patrick R. Roche, Reg. No. 29,580
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582